

REMARKS

Claims 22-26 and 28-30 are pending. Claims 21-24 have been amended. Claims 1-21 and 31-38 are canceled. Claims 28-29 are previously presented. Claims 25-26 and 30 are original. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-16, 21-26, 28 and 31-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Adachi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,293,262) in view of Abileah (U.S. Pat. No. 5,262,880). Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Adachi et al. in view of Abileah and in further view of An et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,724). Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Adachi et al. in view of Abileah and in further view of Kanatsu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,825). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following remarks.

Amended independent claim 22 recites a combination of elements including features of "a first diffusion plate and a first optical sheet attached to the LCD panel such that the first diffusion plate and the first optical sheet are disposed between the LCD panel and the plurality of fluorescent lamps; at least two heat protection plates disposed between the first diffusion plate and optical sheet and the plurality of fluorescent lamps; a case supporting the plurality of fluorescent lamps and the at least two heat protection plates, wherein the at least two heat protection plates are disposed in the case and contact the case; a first open area disposed between the at least two heat protection plates and the LCD panel; a second open area disposed between the at least two heat protection plates; and a third open area disposed between the at least two heat protection plates and the plurality of fluorescent lamps." Applicant submits that none of cited references including Adachi et al and Abileah teach or suggest all the limitations

as recited in independent claim 22. Accordingly, the rejections against independent claim 22, and thus the rejections against claims 23-26 and 28-30, which all depend from independent claim 22, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

February 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Gustavo Siller, Jr./
Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
312.321.4200